

**Clean Colorado River Alliance  
Meeting Notes  
June 17, 2005  
Lake Havasu City, Arizona**

***Clean Colorado River Alliance Mission***

*Develop recommendations to address existing water quality problems to ensure Colorado River water quality meets the needs of Arizona, now and in the future.*

**Guest Speakers**

Terry Bracy, Bracy, Tucker, Brown, and Valanzano/CRRSCO  
Bob Schulz, Burns & McDonnell/CRRSCO

**Attendees**

Dean Barlow, Lake Havasu Parks Board  
Joan Card, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality  
Charlie Cassens, Lake Havasu City  
Susan Craig, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality  
Peter Culp, Sonoran Institute  
Bob Ericson, Golden Shores Water Conservation District  
Gene Fisher, LaPaz County Supervisor  
Roger Gingrich, City of Yuma  
Tom Griffin, Griffin & Associates/Mohave County Water Authority  
Jack Hakim, Bullhead City Council  
Kirk Koch, Bureau of Land Management Colorado River District  
Rod Lewis, Gila River Indian Community  
Marie Light, City of Tucson Water Department  
V.C. Danos, Arizona Municipal Water Users Association  
Patty Mead, Mohave County Department of Public Health  
Doug Mellon, Doug Mellon Farms Inc./Yuma Agricultural Advisory Council  
Chuck Ohr, Arizona State Parks  
Rachel Patterson, Mohave County Department of Public Health  
Charles Paradzick, Arizona Game & Fish Department  
Dan Shein, Arizona State Parks  
John Sullivan, Salt River Project  
Doyle Wilson, Lake Havasu City  
Bob Whelan, Mayor, Lake Havasu City  
David "Sid" Wilson, Central Arizona Project

**Welcome and Introductions**

*Joan Card - Water Quality Division Director, ADEQ*

- Welcome and introductions
- Today's purpose – work in groups to confirm pollutants to be addressed, determine participants' major interest and availability and review project plan and report structure

## **Federal Contributions to Major Watershed Pollution Issues**

*Terry Bracy - Bracy, Tucker, Brown, and Valanzano on behalf of Colorado River Regional Sewer Coalition (CRRSCO)*

- While growth is a challenge, the larger, emerging issue is the quality of the water supplied
- Issues involved – nitrates, perchlorate, uranium, metals, and pharmaceuticals which are regional issues
- Models for action – Chesapeake Bay initiative and the Great Lakes program – teach us what can be accomplished with strong regional cooperation and provide a framework to be used
- Need federal funding as there are no piecemeal solutions to the problems facing the Colorado River
- Important to protect “the last water hole in the West” from the multiple threats which endanger it today

Terry Bracy’s Statement on *Federal Role in Protecting Water Quality: A National Perspective* can be downloaded on the CCRA home page.

Bob Schulz, the Arizona Regional Director for Burns & McDonnell, the consulting engineer on Lake Havasu City’s sewer expansion project, also gave a short presentation. Schulz noted that even with the sewer expansion work done in Lake Havasu City and other municipalities along both sides of the Colorado River, the level of contamination has increased due to a larger than expected population explosion. Studies show that nitrates from septic systems were increasing and migrating toward the river.

## **Confirm Pollutants**

### **Input to Date from CCRA and State and Federal Partners**

*Joan Card - Water Quality Division Director, ADEQ*

- Reviewed Draft Pollutant List (see CCRA web site) to provide a summary of the initial conclusions and results of an e-mail and questionnaire sent out to the six other basin states’ Assessment Coordinators
- Responses received from NM, WY, UT, and CO – not CA or NV
- Three of the four states have data or information which concludes that nutrients (including phosphorus), temperature, selenium, and pH are concerns
- Two of the four states reported that bacteria, sediment, and total dissolved solids are problems for the Colorado River or watershed
- Salinity (TDS), selenium, sediment (or turbidity), bacteria and pathogens, and boron were discussed at the April meeting, received additional input from the Alliance, and were recognized by the basin states as problems
- Alliance and basin states initially concur that mercury, nutrients, and dissolved oxygen are concerns

*The remainder of the meeting was a work session facilitated by Susan Craig, ADEQ. The goals and results of the small group working sessions are identified under each agenda topic.*

### **Group Prioritization of Pollutants**

*Group Prioritization of Pollutants was broken into three segments, Pollutants, Criteria Development, and Multi-voting.*

#### Pollutants

*Small groups were asked to identify additional pollutants (not already on the Draft Pollutant List) that affect Colorado River water quality.*

##### *Goal -*

Add any additional pollutants to list to make certain that all water quality problems or pollutants of concern are recognized before prioritizing

##### *Results -*

- An additional category combining nitrogen/nitrates with ammonia was added
- Thallium and arsenic were added
- A metals category was added to include all metals identified on pollutant list

#### Criteria Development

*After the additional pollutants and categories were added, criteria were developed.*

##### *Goal -*

Develop a list of criteria to use for deciding and prioritizing which pollutants to address in the report to the Governor

##### *Results -*

- Eight criteria were developed and are listed below in no particular order of importance
  1. "Current problem, exceed/violate water quality standards" and "number of locations and instances the pollutant exceeds standards"
  2. "Public/aesthetic consideration" or "public perception"
  3. "Causing or anticipated to pose human or ecosystem health concern" and "acute risk of public and/or environmental risk"
  4. "Clearly defined location of pollutant removal"
  5. "Identified sources"
  6. "Hard data, i.e. monitoring threshold"
  7. "Quantity of pollutant or threat/risk"
  8. "Upward trend"
- "Economics" and "natural versus manmade" were also considered as potential criteria, however, the Alliance decided to consider these when working on recommendations versus using them as criteria to rank the pollutants

#### Multi-voting

*Individual Alliance members voted on the pollutants they felt should be addressed using the criteria developed and keeping in mind the Clean Colorado River Alliance Mission.*

##### *Goal -*

Preliminarily determine which pollutants are the leading concerns for the Colorado River in order to identify which pollutants will be addressed in the report to the Governor

**Results -**

- The seven pollutants recognized by the Alliance as the greatest concerns for the Colorado River are (in order based on the number of votes):
  1. Nutrients (nitrogen, nitrates, ammonia, phosphorus)
  2. Metals (chromium, uranium, copper, mercury, arsenic)
  3. Endocrine disrupting compounds
  4. Perchlorate
  5. Bacteria/pathogens
  6. Salinity/total dissolved solids
  7. Sediment/turbidity
- Based on Alliance feedback, nutrients, including phosphorus, were combined with nitrogen/nitrates and ammonia
- It was noted by some Alliance members that perchlorate does not pose a current risk and does not meet the “upward trend” factor, however, the majority felt that it should be addressed in the report as it provides an opportunity to inform and potentially educate the public

*Alliance members who were not present at the meeting will be asked to provide input on the proposed list of pollutants to be addressed in the report.*

**Interest & Availability for Next Steps**

*Members were asked to think about which pollutants they feel passionate about, have the most expertise in, and/or which pollutant(s) most directly impact or are major concerns for their community. A sign-up sheet was passed around to each small group, members filled in their name (or a designee), the pollutant(s) they were most interested in, and their meeting availability.*

**Goal -**

Determine interest and availability of the group to establish subcommittees and group organization

**Result -**

Alliance members provided the requested information

*Alliance members who were not present at the meeting will be asked to provide the same information before the subcommittees are confirmed. Work sessions may be scheduled to develop initial drafts.*

**Proposed Project Plan**

*A Proposed Project Plan was handed out.*

**Goal -**

Show framework of the draft plan for completing the report to the Governor and provide important dates and milestones

**Result -**

Discussion about milestones

*Alliance members will be asked to provide comments via e-mail.*

**Proposed Report Structure**

*A Draft Report Format was handed out and groups were asked to review and submit written comments.*

*Goal -*

Obtain feedback and ideas for potential revisions to the chapters or sections contained in the Draft Report Format

*Result -*

Groups submitted comments and revisions

*Based on the comments received, revisions will be made, and the Draft Report Format will be sent out to the Alliance for comments/revisions. The report format containing essential chapters and sections will be finalized in mid-July.*

**Adjourn**